



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

If, then, the Monroe doctrine, which Captain Mahan would probably *closely* characterize as the supremacy of the United States in the Western World, is to be maintained, we must abandon our historic antecedents and proceed to become a great sea power! But how have we maintained this doctrine up to this time without being a great sea power? Was it our great sea power, or any prospect of such a thing, that led England to respect our government's wishes about the Venezuela boundary? Was it our great sea power that led the French emperor in the sixties to respect our wishes about Mexico? Looked at simply from Captain Mahan's point of view, the military one, there is no conceivable reason why the United States should create a great navy, unless she proposes to become an "expansive" meddler in the affairs of other nations. So great is the internal strength of our country that no nation, with no matter how great a navy, could, as Carl Schurz says, do more than scratch the edges of our territory. From this point of view alone, then, to say nothing of the higher motives which ought to inspire every true American, we ought to keep out of the dangerous business of trying to be naval mistress of the sea. There is plenty of opportunity for us to expand into all quarters of the globe, in perfectly legitimate Christian ways, without great floating fortifications to back us up. The paths of the sea are everywhere freely open to us for all legitimate enterprises.

As if doubtful of his ground, as a citizen of a Christian country, Captain Mahan feels compelled to attempt the impossible task of showing that the spiritual life draws its "loftiest inspirations" from the experience of the soldier. It is true, as he says, that the spiritual life goes to the soldier's experience for some of its "most vivid metaphors." But these are metaphors only, as every New Testament reader must know, whose meaning is something radically different from the bloody deeds of the soldier. But its "loftiest inspirations"! No! A thousand times No! There is a distance which is immeasurable between the charging soldier sacrificing himself on the field of battle *while at the same time trying to kill and mangle as many of his enemies as possible*, and the unarmed, non-resisting Saviour sacrificing himself and putting upon his smitten lips at the excruciating moment on the cross the prayer, "Father forgive them." This is the kind of sacrifice from which the spiritual life draws its "loftiest inspirations." One of the most hopeful signs for the future of our country and of our race is that gradually growing feeling in regard to war which this distinguished naval officer and writer so deeply deplores in the following paragraph:

"Nothing is more ominous for the future of our race than that tendency, vociferous at present, which refuses to recognize in the profession of arms, in war, that something which inspired Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior," which soothed the dying hours of Henry Lawrence, who

framed the ideas of his career on the poet's conception, and so nobly illustrated it in his self-sacrifice; that something which has made the soldier to all ages the type of heroism and of self-denial. When the religion of Christ, of Him who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, seeks to raise before its followers the image of self-control, and of resistance to evil, it is the soldier whom it presents. He Himself, if by office King of Peace, is first of all, in the essence of His Being, King of Righteousness, without which true peace cannot be."

But is King of Righteousness a synonym for King of Killing! We knew that there were men who still justify war in cases of emergency as a necessary but awful instrument, but we thought the day had gone by when men would stand straight up in the midst of our Christian country and say that the profession of arms is the noblest, the most Christian of all professions! We wonder that every sheet in the land has not taken Captain Mahan to task as vigorously as the *Philadelphia Record* does. It says:

"According to Captain Mahan's notion the people of the United States have all along been deceiving themselves in their belief that they were better off without the nightmare of an immense standing army and navy burdening and oppressing the national life. On the contrary, thinks Captain Mahan, Americans should welcome the day that would bring them all the accompaniments of the old world status of armed truce. That such a presentation to Americans of the armed soldier of Europe as the noblest ideal of twentieth-century civilization should be made by an enlightened American is scarcely credible. The most charitable comment thereon must be that from long meditation over the glories of sea-battles and the deeds of naval heroes, Captain Mahan has contracted the European disease of militarism.

The greatness of a state is not its territorial greatness. It is not the Napoleonic expansion that makes a people happier and better. That state is greatest that considers its own home needs most and most seeks to answer them; that makes its soil richer, its harvests greater, its manufactures better, its internal communication more expeditious, its citizens more comfortably housed and fed and clothed, its employers more public-spirited and its employees more educated; and that teaches above all things else the lesson that public honor, public culture, public well-being are a million times more desirable than all the floating armaments and armed camps under the sun."

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SOCIAL PEACE.

It is needless to say that, "for substance of doctrine," we agree most heartily with the statement of the nature of the new patriotism which coming generations are to feel, which we have quoted on another page from Edward Bellamy's new book, "Equality." It is a great mistake, however, to suppose, as Mr. Bellamy does, that this new sort of love of country is to be the fruit solely of the direct movement for economic equality, to promote which his book is written. If economic equality, in whatever form, ever comes about, it will itself be the result of a multitude of causes all converging toward the

one great end of human brotherhood, with all that that means in a religious, social, political and economic way. To declare that all good things in society are to be the fruit of an economic revolution, coming on suddenly as if by magic, is to set up a full grown tree without any roots. The new patriotism, which he prophesies, is already in existence, in many minds and hearts. It is doing its work steadily, internally in leading men to a truer conception of their duties one to another as citizens, and externally in causing them to act in a more sensible way toward other groups of the human family.

A reformer never gains anything by belittling other movements in comparison with the one to which he has set himself. The following sentences show clearly that Mr. Bellamy has only a superficial idea of the aims and work of the peace societies, whose literature he probably knows little about and whose international congresses he quite certainly has never attended :

"It is to be feared," I was moved to observe, "that posterity has not built so high a monument to the promoters of the universal peace societies of my day as they expected."

"They were well meaning enough so far as they saw, no doubt," said the doctor, "but seem to have been a dreadfully short-sighted and purblind set of people. Their efforts to stop wars between nations, while tranquilly ignoring the world-wide economic struggle for existence which cost more lives and suffering in any one month than did the international wars of a generation, was a most striking case of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. As to the gain to humanity which has come from the abolition of all war or possibility of war between nations of to-day, it seems to us to consist not so much in the mere prevention of actual bloodshed as in the dying out of the old jealousies and rancors which used to embitter peoples against one another almost as much in peace as in war, and the growth in their stead of a fraternal sympathy and mutual good-will, unconscious of any barrier of race or country."

Exactly so! But Mr. Bellamy ought to know that the great aim of the peace societies (the promoters of the universal peace societies as he with strange confusion of ideas calls them) is exactly the doing away with the old jealousies and rancors which embitter peoples and the creation in their stead of fraternal sympathy and good-will, and in this way putting an end to war. They are not aiming at the mere prevention of bloodshed, though they are not blind to the world of horror, suffering and *economic* misery which "bloodshed" in our day means, and which they properly use in argument just as Mr. Bellamy does a "sweat-shop." The peace societies are not so "purblind and dreadfully short-sighted" as not to know that war can never be abolished while these old jealousies and rancors remain unabated. Therefore,

they devote their chief energies to the creation of a new order of thought and feeling among the citizens of one nation towards the citizens of other nations. Of course, negatively, they attempt to show that actual war with its horrors and its whirlwinds of fury is totally unworthy of beings calling themselves human and claiming to belong to the same race.

Mr. Bellamy, on his part, does not tell us how the economic world-union of which he so often speaks is to be brought about while these old jealousies and rancors remain. This economic world-union, he says, by putting an end to the *great* economic war of society will thereby put an end to the small international wars. But both these species of war have the same cause or causes,—human selfishness and prejudice, working now socially, now internationally. The economic war is not social only; it is international also. The same jealousies and animosities which keep the nations in a state of armed preparation for war, and leads them from time to time into actual mutual butchery, also keeps them in a *perpetual* commercial war. If the economic war can be removed only by putting an end, measurably at least, to ignorance, prejudices, jealousies and rancors, why may not the international wars of the sword, which Mr. Bellamy holds to be relatively much less important, be gotten rid of, in the same way, with even less difficulty?

We do not undertake the rôle of prophet, but our forecast is entirely different from that of the author of "Equality." International wars will cease long before the great social struggle comes to an end, simply because the difficulties and perplexities concerning the latter are so much greater than in the case of the former. Many of the promoters of universal peace, we among the number, have come to look upon the abolition of war, not so much as an end in itself, great and beneficent as that is, but as a *condition* of the true social development of humanity, along all lines. International wars and preparations for war, with the animosities and jealousies which they engender, keep alive or intensify, throw a baleful influence over the whole internal social life of each of the nations, which is all the more crushing and blighting that the whole organized power of the nation is felt in it. No one cause contributes more to keep alive a contentious, distrustful, selfish, greedy spirit among the masses of the people than the fact that a nation in its organized capacity through its leaders manifests this spirit towards other nations. If it is right and noble for the national government to show animosity, jealousy and self-seeking towards other nations, why may not every man show himself manly and noble by exhibiting the same spirit towards his next-door neighbor! Thus the people reason, led astray by mighty warships and lines of gleaming bayonets.

It is not true that the promoters of universal peace

"tranquilly ignore the world-wide economic struggle for existence." They are keenly alive to it. But they have chosen their own point of attack which seems to them the most advantageous. They are painfully aware of the increased hardness and bitterness of this struggle brought on by the ever-growing burdens of militarism, which are felt almost exclusively by the agricultural and laboring classes. They believe that the overthrow of militarism will at once greatly relieve the strain of the economic struggle for existence, and that the changed ideas and dispositions which shall have brought about this overthrow will at once turn the attention of governments, hitherto too much occupied with international quarrels, to the promotion of the internal welfare of the peoples, either in the ways suggested by the socialists and nationalists, or in other ways which the growing wisdom of men shall have discovered to be wisest.

If "the promoters of the universal peace societies" can succeed in accomplishing, or even aiding a little in accomplishing, this great consummation, to which so many other workers are contributing their best service in their own way, they will have no desire for a monument on Boston Common which may be seen from Mr. Bellamy's air-ships of the future, for they will already have erected to themselves a monument which will have satisfied their loftiest ambition.

A CASE OF MILITARY CRUELTY.

We are accustomed to read of harsh and cruel treatment to which soldiers are often subjected in various parts of Europe for petit offenses against military law, but the following story from Chicago is the equal of almost any of them:

On the 22d of October Charles Hammond, a private in the United States Army, "guant and thin, showing plainly the effects of his fourteen days' confinement on bread and water diet in the guard-house at Fort Sheridan," gave under oath, before a board of inquiry, the following circumstances of his disobedience of the orders of Captain Lovering and of the severe and heartless measures taken by that official to enforce his commands:

"On Friday I refused to go to work and was ordered from the guard-room into a cell. Saturday I was told that I would have to appear before a court of inquiry. I told the officers of the guard that they would have to carry me there. Captain Lovering came with two members of the guard, and orders were given to drag me out. This was done. As I went through the guard-room Captain Lovering put his heel over my head and threatened to stamp me in the face. Then I was allowed to walk back to my cell. Later Captain Lovering returned to my cell with four sentries, and gave the order 'Go in and jerk that man out.' Two of the sentries stepped in and threw me to the floor.

"Captain Lovering kicked me in the side while I was down four times with his foot, and as I was dragged over the door sill he gave me a violent kick on the shoulder. He slapped me over the right side to the left, and prodded me twice with his foot, and gave me three more

violent kicks about the shoulders. During this scene he cursed me constantly, using the most vile oaths. Lovering then ordered a rope, and gave orders to have my feet tied. I placed my hands behind my head. Then Lovering and the sentries began to drag me. He prodded me in the right hand with his sword and then in the shoulder.

"I was dragged to the guard-room and out to the porch, where with one hard jerk they started me down the stone steps on my back, across the road. I was dragged over pavements and roads to company D's steps, up the steps, then down again, across the pavement, and finally up into the adjutant's office. Lieut.-Col. Bainbridge ordered the rope untied just as I was called before the court.

"At 2 o'clock I asked to be taken to the hospital, where the doctor sponged the blood from the sword stabs. On Monday I was called before Captain Richards, and have since been in solitary confinement on bread and water."

Being asked why he left his barracks at Plattsburg, N. Y., Mr. Hammond replied: "I had some private business in Chicago, and as the inspector-general was at the barracks I knew the request for release would be refused. I had no intention of deserting, and reported at Fort Sheridan so as not to be so ranked."

When Captain Lovering was called he made no attempt to deny any of the accusing witness' statements. He admitted that by his orders Mr. Hammond had been dragged from the guard-house, and that he had pricked him with his sword; also that he had struck the soldier. None of this treatment, Captain Lovering said, had injured Hammond in the least. The methods used were, in his opinion, necessary for the discipline of the army.

From later reports it appears that the court of inquiry has upheld Captain Lovering's action. Comment on this incident is needless. According to the law and the ethics of militarism "such methods are necessary for the discipline of the army"! Discipline, obedience, must be had at all costs, cruel physical inflictions if they be necessary, and if they do not accomplish the end, then death as the ultimatum! That is the inexorable law under whose reign personal freedom has no meaning, even here in America! The "most vile oaths" which went along with this treatment probably did not receive the attention of the court of inquiry, as they were of entirely minor significance!

SAMUEL J. MAY.

The one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel J. May was celebrated at Syracuse, N. Y., on the 20th of October. It is a little curious that, in these days when the arbitration and peace movement has become the foremost movement of the time and is assuming such world-wide proportions, no place should have been made on the program of the celebration for this important subject. Two of the speakers, Rev. Joseph May of Philadelphia, and Mr. Joseph A. Allen of Medfield, Mass., alluded incidentally to this part of Mr. May's reform work, but the subject, either from neglect or from intention, was excluded from the program. His abolition work, his